



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

# Classical Philology

VOL. IV

January, 1909

No. 1

## STUDIES IN THE GROUPING OF NOUNS IN PLAUTUS

By HENRY W. PRESCOTT

Such familiar groups of nouns in our own language as "Liberty and Equality," "Labor and Capital," "Faith, Hope, and Charity," remind us how clearly our speech reflects political, economic, and religious conditions. Without any doubt a study of similar groups in Latin, properly interpreted, would reveal new phases of social life and thought, or confirm previous impressions derived from more obvious sources. It is noteworthy, too, that even in our own language such groups very regularly fall into pairs or triads, as in the examples quoted. From this point of view a study of word-groups contributes to our knowledge of the development of Latin style (cf. Norden *De Minucii Felicis aetate et genere dicendi*, Greifswald, 1897); in the case of Plautus it is of especial value in so far as the author supplies most of the material for our understanding of the beginnings of an artistic form of expression in Latin, and in his case it is of peculiar interest because the inherent qualities of his mother-tongue, alien features of the Greek which he was adapting, and possibly rhetorical influence, enhance the difficulty of appreciating the individual and the racial characteristics of his style; the value and interest of such a study are apparent from Leo's brief analysis of the poet's peculiarities in the handling of triads (*Analecta Plautina* III, cf. *Anal. Plaut.* II. 36-39).

Several passages of Plautus containing, apparently, ill-assorted nouns have perplexed me in recent years; the connotation of words and the association of ideas proved, on further study, to be somewhat different in Latin from what I had supposed; prejudices occasioned by my own language were removed, and the grouping in many cases began to show at least an orderly disarray which seemed more in sympathy with other characteristics of the poet's art and personality. The following notes, therefore, are intended to throw some light on the poet's meaning and on the association of ideas in his mind; the contribution to a knowledge of his style and environment must be very incidental, limited as the study is to nouns, and to groups of more than three members.

## I

Mere catalogues of commonplace things—food, furniture, parts of the anatomy, etc.—are usually listed without attempt at grouping; but purely external features of sound often bring together items in the catalogue: *sura, pes, statura, tonsus, oculi, nasum vel labra, | malae, mentum, barba, collus: totus . . . Amph. 444*, in which, also, the relative position of the parts of the body is somewhat imperfectly suggested by the juxtaposition; *cum pedibus manibus, cum digitis auribus oculis labris Most. 1118*, in which *cum* superficially divides the groups, and *auribus oculis* perhaps attract each other through their initial syllables (cf. *voce oculis auribus Rud. 224; oculi atque aures atque opinio M. G. 589; ore atque oculis pernigris Poen. 1113*); for other lists of physical characteristics cf. *As. 400, Capt. 647, Merc. 310, 639, Ps. 1218*. Sound-effects alone group some of the items in such cases as *stimulos, lamminas, crucesque compedesque, | nervos, catenas, carceres, numellas, pedicas, boias As. 548, ampullam, strigilem, scaphium, soccos, pallium, | marsupium Pers. 124*. Plautus makes use of all such opportunities: *cursu, luctando, hasta, disco, pugilatu, pila Bacch. 428*, but is content also with *disco, hastis, pila, cursu, armis, equo Most. 152*. When his fancy is free, his indulgence is riotous: so in the orderly arrangement of a lexicographer, *ait sese ire ad Archidemum, Chaeream, Chaerestratum, | Cliniam, Chremem, Cratinum, Diniam, Demosthenem As.*

865; or in the less flexible topographical items Megares, Eretriam, Corinthum, Chalcidem, Cretam, Cyprum, | Sicyonem, Cnidum, Zacynthum, Lesbiam, Boeotiam *Merc.* 646, in which the *cn* of the triad *Sicyonem, Cnidum, Zacynthum* is not to be overlooked, and the *-iam* of the last pair is noteworthy because the poet (perhaps unconsciously) has rejected *Lesbum* in favor of *Lesbiam*, just as in the following example he has chosen *Rhodium* in place of *Rhodum* to correspond with *Lyciam*: Persas, Paphlagonas, | Sinopas, Arabes,<sup>1</sup> Caras, Cretanos, Syros, | Rhodium atque Lyciam, Perediam et Perbibesiam, | Centauromachiam et Classiam Unomammiam, | Libyamque oram <omnem> Conterebromniam *Curc.* 442; and here fact and fancy are mingled with remarkable results. The conspicuous feature of all such catalogues is that such groups as are formed by sound-effects are usually composed of two or three members: the pair or the triad is the almost invariable unit.

House-furnishings are not susceptible of any artistic arrangement on the printed page or in the common speech; yet the following lists are not altogether jumbled: Supellex, aurum, vestis, vasa argentea *Aul.* 343, auro, ebore, argento, purpura, picturis, spoliis, | tum statuis *Caecus*, frag. 1. Aside from an occasional grouping by sounds as *vestis vasa*, and *purpura picturis* (cf. *servi supellex, fundi aedes, omnia Men.* 1158), there is possibly a less external colligation in *auro ebore argento*: so much we may perhaps gather from Cicero—auro, argento, ebore, veste, supellectili (*De leg. agr.* 2. 38), signa, tabulas pictas, omne argentum, aurum, ebur, gemmas (*Verr.* 2. 4. 8, cf. 2. 4. 1), non aurum, non argentum, non vestem, non mancipia (*Verr.* 2. 5. 126), pondus auri, argenti, eboris, purpurae . . . . vestem, . . . . stragulam, . . . . supellectilem, . . . . vasa, . . . . (*Verr.* 2. 2. 176).

Lists of foods show similar concession to sound-effects; the most striking feature of a few such lists is a strange abandonment of logical arrangement:

venio ad macellum, rogitō piscis: indicant  
caros; agninam caram, caram bubulam,  
vitulinam, cetum, porcina: cara omnia. (*Aul.* 373)

<sup>1</sup>We might expect the Greek accusative *Arabas* to complete the harmony of final syllables, but the MSS do not offer any variant.

- 846 iuben an non iubes astitui aulas, patinas elui,  
 847 laridum atque epulas foveri foculis ferventibus?  
 848 alium piscis praestinatum abire? † hic vigilans somniat.  
 849 † alium porcinam atque agninam et pullos gallinaceos?  
 850 † scis bene esse, si sit unde. † pernam atque ophthalmiam,  
 851 horaeum, scombrum et trygonum et cetum et mollem caseum?  
 (Capt. 846)

Tu tibi istos habeas turtures, piscis, avis. (Most. 46)

On Capt. 849 Leo remarks: *mire positus inter pisces et piscium genera, sed loco moveri nequit*; and on Most. 46: *ciborum mirus ordo*. Certainly it is surprising to find *cetum* between *vitulinam* and *porcinam* in the *Aul.*, and pork and lamb and fowl in Capt. 849 between the general term for fish in 848 and the specific fish of 850, 851 (but note *epulas* 847 between *laridum* and *piscis*: cf. Lindsay *ad loc.*), and the general terms for fish and birds following the specific *turtures* in Most. 46 in such a way that the specific term is separated from *avis*. So far as Plautus' text is concerned, the three passages support one another. The peculiar arrangement in the Capt. may be due to the situation and the speaker. Moreover, in his Greek originals Plautus may have found some encouragement for this illogical grouping:

οὐ σκόροδον, οὐ σίραιον, οὐχὶ γήθιον,  
 οὐ βολβόν, οὐ πῦρ, οὐ κύμινον, οὐχ ἄλλας,  
 οὐκ ῥόν, οὐ ξύλ', οὐ σκάφην, οὐ τήγανον.

—Alexis 174 K.

The position of *πῦρ* (and of *ξύλ'*, if it means firewood) is no less strange than the interruption of the natural sequence in our verses.

ἔρῶντι δέ, Κτήσων, τί μᾶλλον συμφέρει  
 ὦν νῦν φέρων πάρεμι; κήρυκας, κτένας,  
 βολβούς, μέγαν τε πουλύπουν ἰχθῦς θ' ἄδρους.

—Alexis 170 K.

Here the general term *ἰχθῦς* after the specific *πουλύπουν* is like the order in the *Most.*, save that there *piscis* interrupts the more natural sequence *turtures avis*.

Again, however, the order simply exposes the tyranny of sound over sense: *cetum* in the *Aulularia* supplies one more *c*-sound;

*piscis* happens to fit into the *p*-sequence of *Capt.* 848, and our author is content therewith, just as *caseum* rather than a fish echoes the *c*-sequence of 851 and *pernam* rather than a fish<sup>1</sup> the *p*-sequence of 849 and the end of 850; *turtures* in the *Most.* reiterates effectively the *t*-sounds of *tu tibi istos*, while *piscis avis* constitute a harmonious sound-group by themselves in which the more logical order *avis piscis* is metrically impossible. In this appreciation of sound-values lies the solution of the *mirus ordo ciborum* of our passages: that the audience smiled at such confusion of thought and harmony of sound is conceivable, but not susceptible of proof.

## II

The examples reviewed above offered the poet little opportunity for grouping by means of thought-content; they have shown his readiness to group words according to sound-values, sometimes at the expense of a logical order. Even when the inner 'content of words supplies a natural association and an opportunity to group according to association of ideas, the element of sound often interrupts the logical order, or sound-groups and thought-groups in turn form the smaller units in the larger compound. Occasionally, of course, thought and sound unite to form a small group. In most cases the effect is that of disorder unless one is in full sympathy with the poet's style. The large groups usually fall into pairs and triads,<sup>2</sup> though these small units vary greatly in clearness and precision; the association of thought in a given group is often very loose and general.

Simple and conventional pairs appear, some of which correspond to later usage: *urbem agrum*,<sup>3</sup> *aras focos*, *seque uti dede-*

<sup>1</sup>Leo objects to *pernam* and *ophthalmiam* in 850, and says we should expect a fish in place of *pernam*. But the weakness of Plautus is such that when once "ham and heye-fish" occurs to him, he does not hunt for "halibut and heye-fish." One needs to know the songs of modern vaudeville to appreciate some sides of Plautus: the familiar refrain "ice-cream, cold-cream, vaseline, and sandwiches" is not pitched in a very much lower key than the passages above.

<sup>2</sup>Of. Norden *De Minucii Felicis aetate et genere dicendi*, pp. 62, 63.

<sup>3</sup>Henceforth the punctuation indicates my interpretation of the grouping; in some cases editors should, I think, adopt it. I should add that throughout the paper an acquaintance with Leo's *Analecta Plautina* III is presupposed; I have not stopped to defend or comment upon the triads in the larger groups because the characteristic features have been recognized by Leo.

rent *Amph.* 226 (cf. Cic. *Deiot.* 8; *Cat.* 4. 24, etc.; patriae parentibus, aris atque focus Sall. *Cat.* 52. 3); cultrum securim, pistillum mortarium *Aul.* 95 (following ignis . . . . aqua and preceding vasa: cf. aquam hinc aut ignem aut vascula aut cultrum aut veru | aut aulam extarem aut aliquid *Rud.* 134); praecantrici coniectrici, hariolae atque haruspicae *M. G.* 693 (cf. hariolos haruspices *Poen.* 791); usus fructus, victus cultus *Merc.* 832 (cf. lexica, s. vv. *usufructus* and *cultus*).

Larger groups better illustrate Plautus' individual characteristics: sed pudicitiam et pudorem et sedatum cupedinem, | deum metum, parentum amorem et cognatum concordiam *Amph.* 840; the passage is artificial as the difficult construction ἀπὸ κοινῶν in the next verse (842) indicates; whether the poet felt any distinction between *pudicitia* and *pudor* or no, whether or no he contrasted these two with the third member of the same group, it is at least clear that the first triad is much less precise than the triad of the second verse with its *deum* . . . . *parentum* . . . . *cognatum* and the appropriate emotions *metum* . . . . *amorem* . . . . *concordiam*. So in ubi quemque hominem aspexero, | si ancillam seu servom, sive uxorem sive adulterum, | seu patrem sive avom videbo *Amph.* 1048, the general term is defined in three pairs, the first two of which are possibly suggested by the characters in the play, but the last abandoning the plot loses the contrast of gender in the members of the first two pairs. The balance is disturbed somewhat differently in modo hic habitat leno, modo adulescens modo senex, | pauper mendicus, rex parasitus, hariolus *Men.* 75, with isolated units at the extremes of the large group, pairs of contrasted members intervening—*adulescens senex*, *rex parasitus* (cf. Ter. *Phorm.* 338 ff.), but these interrupted by a pair of like members—*pauper mendicus*. The three classes of the Roman people, *ingenui libertini servi*, are exhausted (*Leo Anal. Plaut.* II. 39; Kemmer *Die polare Ausdrucksweise* 90, 116) in equitem peditem, libertinum, furem an fugitivom velis, | verberatum, vinctum, addictum *Poen.* 832; with the first pair cf. Romani tollent equites peditesque cachinnum Horace *A. p.* 113, and with the alliterative pair *furem* . . . . *fugitivom* cf. *Ps.* 365, *Trin.* 1024, 1027, and with *furem* = *servom* cf. quid domini faciunt,

audent cum talia *fures*? Verg. *Eclog.* 3. 16; et *dominum* fallunt et prosunt *furibus* Horace *Epist.* 1. 6. 46.

Abstract nouns which from our English point of view appear to have little association with one another will sometimes, on further study, reveal an interrelation in the Latin that conduces to at least a loose grouping. Verse-division, alliteration, and the co-ordinating conjunction suggest a grouping in *rem fidem honorem*, | *gloriam et gratiam* *Trin.* 272; and similarly, perhaps (though it is difficult to say whether *fama* belongs with *res fides* on account of the alliteration, or with *virtus decus*), in *res fides fama, virtus decus* | *deseruerunt* *Most.* 144. Some such grouping is certainly indicated by the usage of Plautus and later prose: *res et fides* *Truc.* 45, *rem fidemque* *Truc.* 58, *res aut honos* Cic. *Quinct.* 9, et *rem et famam* 62, *sive fides . . . sive honos* *De leg. agr.* 2. 23. The other pairs in the following couplet suggest that *virtutes . . . honores* belong together: *sibi sua habeant regna reges, sibi divitias divites*, | *sibi honores sibi virtutes, sibi pugnas sibi proelia* *Curc.* 178. Less symmetrical but quite as characteristic of the author is the grouping of *libertas salus vita, res et parentes, patria et prognati* *Amph.* 650; these groups are not sharply distinguished; in thought *parentes* and *prognati* belong together, but the sound-effects influence the grouping in the last two pairs; the association of ideas for the Roman, especially in the triad, comes out in Cicero's grouping: *salus patria fortunae* *Planc.* 79; *salutem et vitam* *Sest.* 128, *Planc.* 1, *Deiot.* 30, *Verr.* 2. 3. 164; *iura libertatem salutem* *Cluent.* 155; *de periculo salutis ac libertatis* *De leg. agr.* 1. 21. The same general thought is expressed elsewhere in smaller compass and different grouping; (*erum meretrix*) *privabit bonis luce, honore atque amicis* *Truc.* 574. *Lux* in the *Truc.* and *vita* in the *Amph.* obviously correspond; this correspondence and the examples from Cicero perhaps assure us of the association in *ego nunc tibi sum summus Iuppiter*, | *idem ego sum Salus Fortuna Lux, Laetitia Gaudium* *Capt.* 863; the division between the triad and the pair is blurred by the alliterative unity of *Lux Laetitia*, but such lack of distinctness in grouping is not infrequent in our examples.

It is not my intention to ascribe to Plautus a conscious precision in these groupings; it suits my purpose rather to admit a



considerable amount of vagueness, a blurring of the division between groups, a constant rivalry between sound and sense. This, rather than the monotonous precision of Minucius Felix, is what we should expect in the early stages of conscious artistic expression. One cannot be positive that the grouping in the following couplet is that indicated by my punctuation: Amor, Voluptas Venus Venustas, Gaudium, | Iocus Ludus, Sermo Suavisaviatio *Bacch.* 115; in elegiac poetry *Venus* and *Voluptas* occasionally appear in more or less close relation, but there is nothing to prevent a grouping by pairs in the first four words (the caesural pause, indeed, favors it) except the alliterative unity of the three that I have marked as a distinct group; so far as the thought is concerned Gaudium | Iocus Ludus might form a triad (cf. Laetitia Ludum Iocum *Merc.* 846), though the verse-division may form a partial barrier to such a grouping; the association of *iocus ludus* is certain—cf. *Capt.* 770 (ludum iocum), *Merc.* 846 (ludum iocum), *Ps.* 65 (a repetition of our verse), *Cic. Cael.* 46 (ludus iocus), *Verr.* 2. 1. 155 (per ludum et iocum), and Terence *Eun.* 300 (ludum iocumque); the association in the *sermo amatorius* comes out clearly in Ovid: mille facesse *iocos*. turpest nescire puellam | *ludere*: *ludendo* saepe paratur amor *Ars amat.* 3. 367; hos ignava *iocos* tribuit natura puellis; | materia *ludunt* uberiore viri *Ars amat.* 3. 381. The significant thing in the *Bacch.* is the combination of sound-groups and sense-groups. Similarly in these verses: Neptunum, Virtutem Victoriam, | Martem Bellonam *Amph.* 42, in which *Mars* and *Bellona* are associated in thought (cf. nam neque *Bellona* mi unquam neque *Mars* creduat *Bacch.* 847), but *Virtus Victoria* form an alliterative pair as well as a loose unit of thought. A longer list of divinities falls into groups in which the unity is now external, now internal: ita me Iuppiter Iuno, Ceres, | Minerva, Lato (MSS Latona), Spes Opis, Virtus Venus, | Castor Polluces, Mars Mercurius, Hercules, | Summanus Sol Saturnus, dique omnes ament *Bacch.* 892; a more symmetrical grouping is possible if *Ceres Minerva Lato*, and *Mars Mercurius Hercules* may form trinities of female and male divinities, but in cult I find no evidence for these trinities, and Plautus has no parallel; the other groups are for the most part obvious; for *Spes Opis* cf. Sjögren *De particulis*

*copulativis ap. Pl. et Ter.* 25. The character of the speaker and the situation excuse this elaborate grouping: laudem lucrum, ludum iocum, festivitatem ferias, | pompam penum potationes, saturitatem, gaudium *Capt.* 770; *laudem lucrum* is not only an alliterative group but a pair of contrasted ideas (intelleges quantum inter lucrum et laudem intersit *Cic. Phil.* 2. 115); nor is *pompam* (the procession of slaves bringing provisions—*Bacch.* 114, *Cas.* 719, *St.* 683, *Truc.* 549) associated with the other members of the triad merely by sound; in general, sound and sense unite to form the association in each group in rather unusual fashion.

Editors may perhaps question whether it is advisable to indicate by the punctuation, as I have done, the grouping of nouns. In only one case, so far as I have noticed, in these larger groups does so sympathetic an editor as Leo choose this visible means of interpretation: vim metum, cruciatum curam, iurgiumque atque inopiam *Merc.* 162. In his critical note Leo refers to *Merc.* 247 (cura cruciabar), and for *vim metum* to Laberius 102 (nullus timor, vis nulla, nulla auctoritas), *Cic. Caec.* 43 ff. (*vis* produces *terror animi*), *De officiis* 2. 22. For *iurgium . . . inopiam* he might have added the juxtaposition (hardly a grouping) of iniuria, | inopia, contumelia (et dispendium) in *Merc.* 29 (the genuineness of which, however, Leo denies). The difficulty of using punctuation to indicate such grouping will appear from cura miseria aegritudo, lacrumae lamentatio *Merc.* 870; here the alliterative pair stands apart from the rest, and cura miseria aegritudo are partly paralleled by cura aegritudo nimiaeque elegantia *Merc.* 19, but in spite of the possibility of such smaller groups the interrelation of the five nouns is so close as to make the distinction of a triad and a pair somewhat misleading.

### III

Such variety and elasticity and lack of precision in grouping as we have thus far observed should prevent us from viewing with suspicion collocations which appear unsymmetrical. It is our first duty to assure ourselves that we understand the connotation of the words from the Roman point of view; this understanding

occasionally brings partial order out of chaos. Even if this fails, we are not too hastily to question the genuineness of the text.

A perfect balance accentuated by the verse-division is obvious in *qui aut Nocti aut Dii | aut Soli aut Lunae miseras narrant suas Merc. 4* (cf. *si tu illum solem sibi solem esse diceres, | se illum lunam credere esse et noctem qui nunc est dies Bacch. 699*). But when we read such a different grouping as *diem, aquam, solem lunam, noctem, haec argento non emo As. 198* (in which *solem lunam* again attract each other, *diem . . . noctem* bracket the group, *aqua* interrupts the symmetry), Leo's critical note seems unsympathetic: "nescio an dies et nox ad *solem lunam* interpretamenta sint, cum in versum reciperentur male collocata (aliter *Bacch. 255, 699 f.*).<sup>1</sup> Certainly *Bacch. 255*, to which Leo refers, rather confirms our notion that Plautus is not to be held to any rigid precision in grouping, instead of justifying a suspicion that *As. 198* is not altogether the work of Plautus; *Bacch. 255* reads: *Volcanus, Luna Sol, Dies, di quattuor, | scelestiorem nullum inluxere alterum. Luna Sol* (MSS *Sol Luna*) again form a pair, *Volcanus* and *Dies* are rather loosely prefixed and appended, *Dies* is perhaps attracted to *di* for sound-effect.<sup>1</sup>

With even less approval do I regard the objections of Ribbeck (*Emendat. Merc. Pl. Spicilegium 13*) to a part of another long

<sup>1</sup> *Volcanus* is certainly not easy to account for. The editors are reminded of Caesar's trinity of German gods, *Solem et Vulcanum et Lunam* (*B. G. 6. 21*), but this hardly explains the arrangement in Plautus. Nor may one derive much satisfaction from Servius (*Aen. 3. 35*): *nonnulli eundem Solem et Vulcanum dicunt*: cf. Hesychius, s. v. "Ἡφαίστος · παρά τισι δὲ ὁ ἥλιος; both of which statements may reflect Orphic identification (cf. *Festschrift für Gomperz 8*). The very late and peculiar account of an alliance between *Sol* and *Vulcanus* in Paulinus Nola c. 32. 135 ff. (cf. Wissowa *Religion der Römer* 187, n. 2) is hardly available. I think we may perhaps explain the appearance of *Volcanus* in Plautus as in some measure due to his Greek source; elsewhere in Plautus (*Epid. 673, Men. 330, Aul. 359, Amph. 341, Rud. 761*) *Volcanus = ignis*; it may be that the poet was adapting to his Roman audience some such philosophy as is illustrated by Menander 537 K.: ὁ μὲν Ἐπίχαρμος τοὺς θεοὺς λέγει | ἀνέμους, ὕδωρ, γῆν, ἥλιον, πῦρ, ἀστέρας (cf. Menander 481 K.: τοῦτον εὐτυχέστατον λέγω | ὅστις θεωρήσας ἀλύπως, Παρμένων, | τὰ σεμνὰ ταῦτ' ἀπῆλθεν, ὅθεν ἦλθεν, ταχύ, | τὸν ἥλιον τὸν κοινόν, ἄστρ', ὕδωρ, νέφη, | πῦρ). The appearance of *aqua* in *As. 198* may also be due to some such passage as these two of Menander, although the idea in the *As.* is more in sympathy with the second fragment than the first; cf. *A.P. 10. 123. 3-4*: ἡδέα μὲν γάρ σοι τὰ φύσει καλὰ, γαῖα, θάλασσα, | ἄστρο, σεληναῖης κύκλα καὶ ἡελίου.

list of nouns; the lover describes the zeal with which he will overcome difficulties in searching for his *amica*:

neque mihi ulla obsidet amnis nec mons neque adeo mare,  
nec calor nec frigus metuo neque ventum neque grandinem;  
imbrem perpetiar, laborem sufferam, solem, sitim. (*Merc.* 859)

Ribbeck exclaims: "quid ibi, quaeso, imbris et solis commemoratio post enumeratas in v. 860 tempestates sibi volunt? et quam perverse inter caeli iniurias vaga laboris notio infertur!" Although Leo seems to sympathize with Ribbeck to some extent in the branding of the last verse, his reference to Tibullus i. 2. 29 ff. certainly answers Ribbeck's second objection: non mihi pigra nocent hibernae frigora noctis, | non mihi cum multa decidit imber aqua. | non labor hic laedit, . . . . There can be no doubt that, in the *sermo amatorius*, *labor* was easily associated with the disagreeable effects of the weather. But the noteworthy feature of the verse is the distinctly Plautine arrangement of the nouns: the nouns naturally associated in meaning are *labor* and *sitis* (cf. servitus sudor sitis *Merc.* 674), *imber* and *sol*; but the members of these two pairs are separated one from the other that the verse may end with the sibilant *sufferam solem sitim*, begin with a succession of *mbr*-sounds, and produce other sound-effects which are more easily appreciated than described.

#### IV

The *Mercator*, from the Greek of Philemon, contains a remarkable number of groups of adjectives and verbs as well as of nouns (4, 19 ff., 25 ff., 162, 310, 630, 640, 646, 674, 833, 846 ff., 852 ff., 859 ff., 870). Perhaps the Greek author was prone to forming extensive groups of words of the same category (cf. Leo *Anal. Plaut.* III. 8). Most of these groups have already been discussed. Two are of such extent and difficulty as to require special treatment.

The longest of the groups has aroused suspicion. Leo, after Dziatzko, brackets the greater part of it; Ribbeck rejects the whole of it (*Spicilegium* 8 ff.); forming as it does part of the prologue, it has suffered from the general prejudice against that portion of the play. It is not my purpose primarily to defend the

authenticity of the whole or any part of it, but to consider it without prejudice as it stands. The lover, Charinus, interrupts his account of his love affair with a digression (which, he says, is characteristic of lovers); this digression consists of a list of the *vitia* to which a lover is subject; I print the text of Leo (*Merc.* 18 ff.):

- nam amorem haec cuncta vitia sectari solent,  
cura aegritudo nimiaque elegantia,  
20 [haec non modo illum qui amat, sed quemque attingit  
magno atque solido multat infortunio,  
nec pol profecto quisquam sine grandi malo  
praequam res patitur studuit elegantiae.  
sed amori accedunt etiam haec quae dixi minus:  
25 insomnia, aerumna, error, terror et fuga,  
ineptia stultitiaque adeo et temeritas,  
incogitantia excors, immodestia,  
petulantia et cupiditas, malevolentia,  
inertia (MSS ineret etiam), aviditas, desidia, iniuria,  
30 inopia, contumelia et dispendium,]  
multiloquium:  
.  
.  
.  
37 nunc vos mi irasci ob multiloquium non decet.

Leo's comment is contained in his critical note introducing the prologue: . . . . tantum amplificatio versuum 18. 19, quae legitur vv. 20–30, aut retractata aut post Plautum scripta est, quippe quae vitiorum ordinem nullum praebeat sed fortuitam et qualem versus patiebantur farraginem (cf. Dziatzko *Rhein. Mus.* XXVI. 437); scilicet componenda sunt cupiditas et aviditas, malevolentia iniuria contumelia, inopia dispendium, haec ad elegantiam, insomnia aerumna ad curam aegritudinem (19) pertinent: haec in initio, dispendium in fine catalogi.

This criticism involves certain presuppositions which all of us are not prepared to grant: e. g., that Plautus may not repeat and amplify his own words (cf. Kellerman *De Plauto sui imitatore*, Leipzig, 1903), that a *fortuita farrago* (if properly defined) is not characteristic of his style. Without begging these important questions let us consider the connotation of the words in the passage; let us discover, if it be possible, whether this connotation

affords any justification for the arrangement: from the results of our previous study we shall infer only that sound and sense will be important factors.

Cura aegritudo nimiaque elegantia (19) constitute a loose triad, the genuineness of which Leo does not question: the third member of the triad is not so closely associated with the first two as they are with each other, but this is characteristic (cf. *Anal. Plaut.* III. 12-16). A closer triad is found in cura miseria aegritudo . . . . *Merc.* 870. Cura is a commonplace of the *sermo amatorius*; for aegritudo cf. Amor amara dat tamen, satis quod aegre sit *Trin.* 260, and for cura and aegritudo cf. fuisset tum illos mi aegre aliquod dies, | at non cottidiana cura haec angeret animum Terence *Phorm.* 159; for elegantia<sup>1</sup> cf. (a description of Amor) blandiloquentulus, harpago, mendax, cuppes, avarus, elegans, despoliator *Trin.* 239.

There follows (20-23) a parenthetical digression enlarging upon the disastrous effects of elegantia: not only is the lover ruined, sed quemque attigit (elegantia amatoris). Awkward as the parenthesis is, it is perhaps worth noting that the transition from the triad to the digression is somewhat like the sequence of thought in the same lyrical passage of the *Trinummus* to which we have referred already and which serves to parallel so many parts of our passage (the *Trinummus*, also, is from the Greek of Philemon); in the *Trinummus* the lover's extravagance has been described at length (242-54); this extravagance makes him an *inops amator* (255); the conclusion is that although it is dulce to lead this life of expensive dissipation, Love amara dat tamen, satis quod aegre sit (cf. aegritudo); then the far-reaching effects of this elegantia and aegritudo are perhaps suggested in 261-64: the lover fugit forum, fugitat suos cognatos, fugat ipse se ab suo contutu | neque eum sibi amicum volunt dici.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>The transition from fastidiousness to extravagance is easy in experience and semasiology: cf. in a very different context: Crassus erat elegantium parcissimus, Scaevola parcorum elegantissimus Cic. *Brut.* 148, where the contrast between elegans and parvus suggests the meaning of the lover's elegantia. Cf. Gellius, 11. 2. 1; Nonius 465. 11.

<sup>2</sup>The idea is that briefly expressed in *Truc.* 574: (erum meretrix) privabit bonis luce, honore atque amicis.

In 24 the speaker resumes the *vitia*. *Insomnia* and *aerumna* are drawn to each other by the *-mn-* common to both of them. For the lover's *aerumna* cf. qui amans egens ingressus est princeps in Amoris vias | superavit aerumnis is suis aerumnas Herculi *Pers.* 1; edepol qui amat, si eget, adficitur misera aerumna *Curc.* 142. The transition from *aerumna* to the group *error, terror et fuga* is a natural one for the Roman: cf. furor atque aerumna gravescit (amantis) *Lucr.* 4. 1069; and in philosophical parlance: ex quibus humanae vitae *erroribus* et *aerumnis* fit ut. . . . Cic. *Frag. deperd. libr. phil.* v. 88 Baiter-Kayser; Plautus himself associates the ideas: multiplex *aerumna* me exercitam habet, | paupertas, *pavor* territat mentem animi *Epid.* 529. *Error, terror et fuga* are associated in sound (cf. alor error pavor *Rud.* 215) and in thought. The association in thought between *error* and *terror* seems to reflect psychological theory: cf. quod errorem animis perturbationemque adferat Cic. *De div.* i. 62; ergo ut constantia scientiae, sic perturbatio erroris est Cic. *Tusc. disp.* 4. 80. Indeed the general association of ideas in this verse and in the following verses is clearer to me after reading a passage of Cicero (obviously of Greek origin: was the Greek of Philemon's play influenced by a similar theory?):

huius igitur virtutis contraria est vitiositas—sic enim malo . . . . appellare eam quam Graeci *κακίαν* appellant; . . . . ex qua concitantur *perturbationes*, quae sunt. . . . *turbidi animorum concitatioque motus, aversi a ratione* et inimicissimi mentis vitaeque tranquillae. inportant enim *aegritudines* anxias atque acerbis animosque adfligunt et debilitant metu; idem inflammant *adpetitione nimia*, quam tum *cupiditatem* tum libidinem dicimus, inpotentiam quandam animi *a temperantia et moderatione plurimum dissidentem*. quae si quando adepta erit id quod ei fuerit concupitum, tum eferetur alacritate, “ut nihil ei constet” quod agat, ut ille qui “voluptatem animi nimiam summum esse errorem” arbitratur. eorum igitur malorum in una virtute posita sanatio est. quid autem est non miserius solum, sed foedius etiam et deformius quam *aegritudine* quis adfectus, debilitatus, iacens? cui miseriae proximus est is qui adpropinquans aliquod malum metuit exanimatusque pendet animi. quam vim mali significantes poetae inpendere apud inferos saxum Tantalo faciunt . . . . ea communis poena *stultitiae* est; omnibus enim quorum mens abhorret a ratione, semper aliqui talis *terror* inpendet. atque ut haec tabificae mentis perturbationes sunt, *aegritudinem* dico et *metum*, sic hilariores illae, *cupiditas avide semper aliquid expetens* et

inanis alacritas, id est laetitia gestiens, non multum differunt ab *amentia*. ex quo intellegitur qualis ille sit quem tum *moderatum*, alias *modestum*, tum *temperantem*, alias constantem continentemque dicimus; non nunquam haec eadem vocabula ad frugalitatis nomen tamquam ad caput referre volumus. quod nisi eo nomine virtutes continerentur, nunquam ita pervolgatum illud esset ut iam proverbii locum obtineret, hominem frugi omnia recte facere. quod idem cum Stoici de sapiente dicunt, nimis admirabiliter nimisque magnifice dicere videntur. (*Tusc. disp.* 4. 34-36.)

These words and ideas also have their place in the *sermo amatorius*. For the idea in *error* cf. Pichon *De sermone amatorio*, s. v. *errare*, especially Blanditiae comites tibi erunt Errorque Furorque Ovid *Amor.* i. 2. 35. This mad impetuosity of love causes the lover's apprehension; *terror* is not the technical word for this, but is here chosen in place of the usual *timor* or *metus* for the assonance with *error*; this apprehension in the *sermo amatorius* is usually a fear "imprimis ne fallantur aut decipiantur" (Pichon *De sermone amatorio*, s. vv. *timere*, *metuere*): cf. fit quoque longus amor, quem diffidentia nutrit: | hunc tu si quaeres ponere, pone *metum*. | qui *timet* ut sua sit, nequis sibi detrahat illam, | ille Machaonia vix ope sanus erit Ovid *Remed. amor.* 543; (Propertius fears that Cynthia is proving faithless at Baiae) non quia perspecta non es mihi cognita fama, | sed quod in hac omnis parte *timetur* amor, and he adds that if the letter causes her sorrow, culpa *timoris* erit Prop. i. 11. 17; *timidus* sum (ignosce *timori*) | et miser in tunica suspicor esse virum Prop. ii. 6. 13; (Propertius fears that Lynceus has stolen the affections of Cynthia) ipse meas solus, quod nil est, aemulor umbras, | stultus, quod stulto saepe *timore* tremo Prop. ii. 34. 19. There are, to be sure, other occasions for the lover's fear; but generally it is the discovery that this sort of fear is justified, that the object of one's love is unattainable, which leads to the *fuga*<sup>1</sup> here combined with

<sup>1</sup> This interpretation differs from that of Leo, who refers to *Trin.* 259 ff. But as I understand the *Trinummus*, the *fuga* there is not the conventional *fuga*, but the result of loss of self-respect; as Plautus expresses it in *Truc.* 574: (erum meretrix) privabit bonis luce, *honore atque amicis*. It seems to me more likely that *terror* in our passage requires the sort of *fuga* conventional in the *sermo amatorius*, especially as this often results from the lover's discovery that his *metus* or *timor* is justified. And I regard it as certain that the author of our verses, whether Plautus or not, would have in mind the action of the play, in which *terror* and *fuga*, as I show above, are perfectly illustrated.



*terror*. This association of *terror* and *fuga* in this sense cannot be better illustrated than by Charinus' own experience as set forth in the action of the *Mercator* 588 ff. At the beginning of this scene, before and after the entrance of Eutychus with the news that the girl has become the property of another, the *terror* of Charinus is vividly portrayed. No sooner is he acquainted with the facts than he gives way to utter dejection which issues in the determination to leave the country: non possum durare, certumst exsulatum hinc ire me (644). Eutychus' arguments against this decision are also worth quoting, not only because they set forth the conventional aspects of this *fuga* (Love is not to be eluded: cf. Pichon *op. cit.*, s. v. *fugere*; Hoelzer *De poesi amatoria a comicis Atticis exculta*, etc. 13 ff.), but also because the passage illustrates certain connotations of *inopia* and *cupiditas* that may serve us later in interpreting vss. 30, 28 of our prologue:

quid tu ais? quid quom illuc quo nunc ire paritas veneris,  
 si ibi amare forte occipias atque item eius sit *inopia*,  
 iam inde porro aufugies, deinde item illinc, si item evenerit?  
 quis modus tibi *exsilio* tandem eveniet, quis finis *fugae*?  
 quae patria aut domus tibi stabilis esse poterit? dic mihi.  
 cedo, si hac urbe abis, amorem te hic relicturum putas?  
 si id fore ita sat animo acceptum est, certum id, pro certo si habes,  
 quanto te satiust rus aliquo abire, ibi esse, ibi vivere,  
 adeo dum illius te *cupiditas* atque amor missum facit. (649-57)

*Error, terror et fuga*, therefore, in Charinus' own experience represent an unbroken sequence; for that *error* forms a part of his experience is stated at least once: miser amicam mihi paravi, animi causa, pretio eripui, | ratus clam patrem me meum posse habere; is rescivit et vidit et perdidit me; | neque is quom roget quid loquar cogitatumst, | ita animi decem in pectore incerti certant | . . . tantus *cum cura* meost *error* animo 341-47. It is true that here the *error* is mere uncertainty of purpose, but such mental perturbation variously manifested is the *error* referred to in the *sermo amatorius* and in the psychological theory.

The transition from this group to the triad of *vitia* in 26 is also perfectly smooth. The passage quoted from the *Tusculan Disputations* states that the *perturbationes* are *aversi a ratione*,

and Cicero elsewhere associates the ideas of 25 and 26: e. g., *error et temeritas* populorum (rem) a multitudine ad paucos transtulit *Repub.* i. 52; *errorem* autem et *temeritatem* . . . . *Acad.* i. 42; *errore*, levitate, *temeritate* *Acad.* ii. 66. The triad itself is formed in Plautus' characteristic fashion; the first two members are almost synonymous, the third describes a more intense manifestation of the same qualities (cf. Leo *Anal. Plaut.* III. 15: . . . . tertium quod additur vim sermoni non per numerum tantum addit, eo quod . . . . in gradum altiore educit). In the *sermo amatorius* the lover's folly is a commonplace and needs no illustration; his rashness is less conventional, but cf. Pichon *op. cit.* s. v. *temerarius*.<sup>1</sup>

The irrational condition produced by love is described in still stronger terms in the pair of vs. 27, *incogitantia excors*, *immodestia*. So Cicero in the *Tusc. disp.* above, after describing the effects of the *perturbationes*, concludes: *ex quo intellegitur qualis ille sit quem tum moderatum, alias modestum, tum temperantem, alias constantem continentemque dicimus*. The pair is linked together by the common initial syllable. The adjective *excors* makes the group unsymmetrical, but no more so than *nimia* in the triad of 19, and the *co*-sounds in *incogitantia excors* bind the two together; cf. *exordem caecum incogitabilem* *M. G.* 544.

Just before his reference to the *homo modestus*, Cicero discriminates between two kinds of *perturbationes*: *tabificae*, including *aegritudo* and *metus*; *hilariores*, including *cupiditas avide semper aliquid expetens et inanis alacritas*. The lover's *cupiditas* is for the object of his love: so Eutychus in 656 asks Charinus why he does not rusticate adeo dum illius te *cupiditas* atque amor missum facit. Amor himself is *harpago* . . . . *cuppes*, *avarus* . . . . *Trin.* 239. In vs. 28 of our passage this *cupiditas* is grouped with *petulantia*. We expect some association

<sup>1</sup>In Greek philosophy the equivalent of *temeritas* is *προπέτεια*; in this connection it is interesting to note Kaibel's skilful interpretation of *προπέτεια*, with the help of philosophical theory, in Callimachus' amatory epigram 42 (W.); cf. *Hermes* XXXI (1896), 266-68:

εἰ μὲν ἐκὼν Ἀρχὴν ἐπεκώμασα, μυρία μέμφου,  
εἰ δ' ἄκων ἦκω, τὴν προπέτειαν ἔα.  
"Ἀκρητος καὶ Ἔρως μὲν ἠνάγκασαν, ὧν ὁ μὲν αὐτῶν  
ἐλκεν, ὁ δ' οὐκ εἰς τὴν προπέτειαν εἶν.

between them. This is supplied at once by Cicero's *cupiditas auide semper aliquid expetens*, if we remember the same author's *a petendo petulantia* (*Repub.* 4. 6). The word is very generally combined with *obscenitas*, *libido* in Cicero: cf. Merguet's *lexica s. v.*; e. g., *semper audax, petulans*, *libidinosus* Sull. 71. And in one case we get in Cicero the same grouping as in Plautus: *ea res nunc enim in discrimine versatur, utrum possitne se contra luxuriam ac licentiam rusticana illa atque inculta parsimonia defendere, an deformata atque ornamentis omnibus spoliata, nuda cupiditati petulantiaeque addicatur* *Quinct.* 92. For the use of the idea in the *sermo amatorius* cf. Pichon, *op. cit.*, *s. v. petere*.<sup>1</sup>

In the same verse with this pair of words stands a third, *malevolentia*. Leo asserts that this is out of place, that its association is properly with *iniuria* (29) and *contumelia* (30). I am convinced that a full understanding of the meaning of the word will justify its position, that it has no connection in thought with *iniuria* and *contumelia* but a connotation that makes *cupiditas* and *petulantia* congenial company. The idea best suited to the grouping here is suggested in *Capt.* 583: *est miserorum ut malevolentes sint atque inuideant bonis*; cf. *malevolentia et invidia* Sall. *Cat.* 3. 2. *Malevolentia* is not a technical word in the *sermo amatorius*; *invidia* is the regular term, and usually of the lover's envy of a real or imaginary rival (Pichon *op. cit.*, *s. v. invidere*). The association between the lover's craving for the delights of love, and his envy of the rival who seems to be enjoying them, makes *petulantia et cupiditas* and *malevolentia* altogether congenial neighbors.

Up to this point the juxtaposition of the nouns and their grouping seems above criticism. Thought-units or sound-units have been formed in a fashion quite in harmony with the practice of our author. The transition from group to group has been easy and natural. No such contention can be established for vss. 29, 30. If any verses are to be excised because of illogical arrangement,

<sup>1</sup> Is not *petulantia* in *Cist.* 672 to be directly connected with *peto*? Halisca has lost something valuable; the insistent need of seeking it (cf. 678-87) makes her wretched. I cannot understand Ussing's interpretation (note on vs. 505): *petulantia* = *neglegentia*. The lover's *petulantia linguae* is best brought out in Propertius i. 16. 37; cf. Suet. *Tib.* 61.

these might well furnish some ground for such action. But it is at least an open question whether Plautus is to be held to such strict account, and in any case the juxtaposition in these verses is not necessarily so bad as Leo states.

Vs. 29 begins with a corrupt reading in the MSS. *Ineret etiam* is usually read as *inerit etiam* (Lindsay notes that the MSS reading may represent *inhaeret*). Leo rather plausibly emends to *inertia* (*Archiv für lat. Lex.* IX. 164), which preserves the list of nouns from interruption, but adds to the disorder; for *inertia* belongs with *desidia*. *Aviditas* certainly is a repetition or intensification of *cupiditas*. *Desidia* is regularly used of the inactivity that seems in the *sermo amatorius* to be almost synonymous with love; so in *Merc.* 62: non, ut ego, *amori* neque *desidia* in otio | operam dedisse . . . . (cf. the last stanza of Catullus 51 on *otium*, and Eur. frag. 324 N. "Ἐρως γὰρ ἀργὸν καὶ τὸ τοῖς ἀργοῖς ἔφν; Stobaeus *Flor.* 64. 29 Θεόφραστος ἐρωτηθεὶς τί ἐστὶν ἔρως, πάθος ἔφη ψυχῆς σχολαζούσης; Ovid *Remed. amor.* 135–44; Plautus *Truc.* 136–42); it is noteworthy that *desidia* is sharply contrasted with *virtus*: cape sis *virtutem* animo et corde expelle *desidiam* tuo *Trin.* 650, cum *virtute* non cum *desidia* Cic. *Sest.* 138, invidiam placare paras *virtute* relicta? | contemnere, miser. vitanda est inproba Siren | *desidia*, . . . . Horace *Sat.* 2. 3. 13. This connection between inactivity and active wrong-doing might, with some straining, excuse the juxtaposition of *desidia* and *iniuria*. But *iniuria* is not so often used of actual violence in the *sermo amatorius* as of the faithlessness of the beloved (Pichon *op. cit.*, s. v., and Rothstein's note on Prop. i. 18. 23). It is quite clear to me, however, that Leo's assertion that malevolentia iniuria contumelia, inopia dispendium, should properly be grouped together does not do justice to the juxtaposition in the text. *Malevolentia* I have already explained. The connection between iniuria, | inopia, contumelia is apparent from a verse later in this play: Acanthio brings Charinus the news that the girl has been seen by his father; Charinus in trying to get this information says: quid fers? dic mihi. Acanthio answers: vim metum, cruciatum curam, iurgium-que atque inopiam *Merc.* 161, 162 (cf. above p. 9). The association of *iurgium* and *inopia* may well justify the arrangement

before us in the prologue: *inopia* is not necessarily the poverty of the *inops* or *pauper amator*, but the condition of being without the object of one's love whether through lack of money or any other cause; this appears also from this same play 650, 651: Eutyclus tries to persuade Charinus not to go into exile on account of his losing his sweetheart; *quid tu ais? quid quom illuc quo nunc ire paritas veneris, | si ibi amare forte occipias atque item eius sit inopia, iam inde porro aufugies, . . . ?* This sort of *inopia* is not limited to our play; cf. (of Amor) *is mores hominum moros et morosos ecfcit: | minus placet magis quod suadetur, quod dissuadetur placet; | quom inopiast, cupias, quando eius copiast, tum non velis Trin.* 669; and Phaedria, a lover as yet not in possession of his beloved to Antipho already married: *tu conicito cetera, | quid ego ex hac inopia nunc capiam et quid tu ex istac copia Terence Phorm.* 166. That violent words and acts attend the lover's *inopia* is natural enough, as the grouping *iurgiumque atque inopiam* in *Merc.* 162 attests. It is of course true that such *inopia*, since the woman is regularly a *meretrix*, is usually a result of *inopia argenti*, but our present purpose is simply to defend the juxtaposition of *iniuria*, | *inopia, contumelia*. It must be granted that the regular grouping in Latin associates *iniuria contumelia*,<sup>1</sup> and that *inopia* even with the meaning which it consistently bears in the *Mercator* might properly be combined with *dispendium*, but some allowance must be made for the attraction which *iniuria* | *inopia* have for each other (even though they stand in different verses<sup>2</sup>) because of the common syllable *in-*. A comparison with *Merc.* 859 (above p. 11) and other examples in our discussion should have made us familiar with the concessions that our author is ever ready to make for sound-effects.

After this solemn exposition of the *vitia*, it is certainly time for the speaker's humor to assert itself as it does by introducing as a

<sup>1</sup> *Patior facile iniuriam, si est vacua a contumelia Pacuv.* 279, 280, on which Nonius remarks (430. 15): . . . *iniuria enim levior res est.* And see the lexica, s. vv. *contumelia, iniuria*.

<sup>2</sup> The effect of verse-division in such grouping remains to be determined: for the present we may note *Gaudium | Iocus Ludus Bacch.* 115, and the association in meaning in *inopiam | solitudinem Merc.* 848 (cf. *huius inopia et solitudo commemoratur Cic. Rosc. Amer.* 20, *Quinct.* 5), although the genuineness of the latter verse of Plautus remains to be discussed in the next section.

*maximum vitium* in vs. 31 *multiloquium*; this is elaborated in mock-serious fashion with the conclusion (37): nunc vos mi irasci ob multiloquium non decet. It is difficult to see what becomes of the humor involved in this inclusion of *multiloquium* among the *vitia*, if the verses 20–30 which exemplify this *vitium* are expunged.

## V

An extremely artificial grouping of nouns is ascribed to Plautus in Leo's interpretation of another passage in the *Mercator*, and a verse containing four nouns appended, without grouping, to the preceding group is expunged:

- ecquisnam deus est qui mea nunc laetus laetitia fuat?  
 845 domi erat quod quaeritabam: sex sodales repperi,  
 vitam, amicitiam, civitatem, laetitiam, ludum, iocum;  
 eorum inventu res simitu pessumas pessum dedi,  
 iram, inimicitiam, maerorem, lacrumas, exsilium, inopiam,  
 [solitudinem, stultitiam, exitium, pertinaciam]. (844–49)

Leo's note reads as follows (on 848):

Respondet ira ioco, maeror ludo, lacrumae laetitiae, exilium civitati, inopia vitae; sic Ribbeckius l. s. [= *Emend. Merc. Pl. Spicilegium*] 12 sq., qui delevit v. 849 (cf. Loewius praef. XIII) et agnovit amplificatorem qui versus 24 sq. finxit; idem interpolatum verum locum occupasse dixit desiderati post eum a Ritschelio, quo Charinus nominatus fuerit. solitudo ad inopiam pertinet (Cic. *Pro Quinct.* 5, *Pro Rosc. Amer.* 20, *Ad Q. fr.* 1. 1. 25), pertinacia ad iram (*De fin.* 1. 28). cf. Ter. *Ad.* 303.

In other words 846 and 848 show an approximately chiasmic balancing of contrasted ideas; the chiasmus is, however, marred by the position of *amicitiam* and *inimicitiam*, and such an artificial chiasmic grouping of nouns is without parallel in Plautus. But let us have Leo's interpretation clearly before us: vitam ~ inopiam, amicitiam ~ inimicitiam, civitatem ~ exsilium, laetitiam ~ lacrumas, ludum ~ maerorem, iocum ~ iram; on the other hand 849 is not genuine, but *solitudo* expands the idea of *inopia* in 848, *pertinacia* the idea of *ira* in 848; the amplifier is the same person who invented vss. 24 ff. discussed in the previous section of this paper. My own contention is that Plautus was quite oblivious of any such chiasmic arrangement, that he was more or less conscious of

two triads in 846 and of three pairs in 848, that the contrast between 846 and 848 is only in the general content of each verse and not between individual members of the two groups of six; finally, that the grouping practically ceases in 849, though the ideas in 849 are in harmony with the content of 848, that 849 may be a later addition, but is comparable to the looser additions in 29–31 as compared with the firmer grouping of 19, 25–28 in the passage discussed in the previous section. The evidence for my interpretation I present as briefly as possible.

1. *Vita amicitia civitas*.—The reflection of Greek philosophical theories of friendship in Plautus Leo has himself briefly indicated in *Plaut. Forsch.* 114 ff. It is not an improbable assumption that the interrelation of life, friendship, and the body politic set forth in Cicero *De amicitia* 22, 23 represents views current in Greece in the time of Philemon:

Principio qui potest esse “vita vitalis,” ut ait Ennius, quae non in amici mutua benevolentia conquiescit? . . . id si minus intellegitur, quanta vis amicitiae concordiaeque sit, ex dissensionibus atque ex discordiis perspicui potest: quae enim domus tam stabilis, quae tam firma civitas est, quae non odiis et discidiis funditus possit everti? ex quo quantum boni sit in amicitia iudicari potest.<sup>1</sup>

2. *Laetitia ludus iocus*.—*Ludus* and *iocus* constitute in Plautus and in later Latin, as we have seen above (p. 8), an inseparable group.<sup>2</sup> To this pair *laetitia* is prefixed for alliterative effect: cf. for the prefixing of a related idea *Gaudium* | *Iocus Ludus Bacch.* 115, and for alliterative effects with *laetitia*, *laetitia lubentiaque St.* 276, *prae laetitia lacrumae St.* 466.

3. *Ira inimicitia*.—Cf. *inimicitia ira ulciscendi tempus observans Cic. Tusc. disp.* 4. 21.

4. *Maeror lacrumae*.—Cf. . . . , *luctum maerorem*, . . . . *Vid.* ii (viii), *cura miseria aegritudo, lacrumae lamentatio Merc.*

<sup>1</sup> To this should be added the dictum in the same essay (86): *sine amicitia vitam esse nullam*, with which should be compared Seneca *Ep.* 9. 17; 6. 4; and the Greek expression of the same thought in Aristotle, *Ethic.* 1155 a. 5: *ἀνευ γὰρ φίλων οὐδεὶς ἐλοιτ' ἂν ἑῆν, ἔχων τὰ λοιπὰ ἀγαθὰ πάντα*. Cf. Bohnenblust *Beiträge zum Topos περί φιλίας* (Bern Diss., Berlin, 1905), p. 11.

<sup>2</sup> This established fact must be the starting-point of any interpretation of the grouping; it at once prevents any such chiasmic grouping as Leo suggests.

870, *persuasit maeror anxitudo, error dolor Accius* 349, *mihi maerores illi luctum, exitium illi exsilium mihi Ennius Trag.* 230 R.

5. *Exsilium inopia*.—The passage from Ennius just quoted shows how congenial this pair is to the preceding pair. For this pair cf. *multis sum modis circumventus, morbo, exsilio atque inopia Ennius Trag.* 20 R., *qui mortem, qui dolorem, qui exsilium, qui egestatem timet Cic. De off.* 2. 38, *egestate exsilio, vinculis verberibus Cic. De repub.* 3. 34. Further evidence may be attainable in Giesecke *De philos. veterum quae ad exilium pertinent sententiis* (Leipzig, 1891), which I have not been able to secure.

6. *Solitudo stultitia, exitium, pertinacia*.—I have no disposition to defend the authenticity of this verse. It is obvious that the *sex sodales* of 845 leads us to expect a parallelism which is destroyed by the ten *sodales* of 848, 849. But a few comments are not out of place. Leo's contention that *solitudinem* belongs in a group with *inopia* is certainly strengthened by his references to Cicero (*Pro Quinct.* 5, *Pro Rosc. Amer.* 20, *Ad Q. fr.* i. 1. 25), though he might more appropriately have quoted Plautus *As.* 163: *solus solitudine ego ted atque ab egestate abstuli*. At the same time it is worth noting that *solitudo* is congenial company for *inimicitia* in the negative sense of "being without friends": for this association cf. Cicero *De amicitia* 87, *De off.* 1. 153, Sen. *Ep.* 9. 17, 6. 4, Dio Chrysost. 3. p. 132 R. (*καὶ μὴν ὦν εἰπον ἡδέων τὸ μὲν κοινωνεῖν φίλοις τερπνότατον· μόνον δὲ ἀπολαύειν ἐν ἐρημίᾳ, πάντων ἀηδέστατον, καὶ οὐδεὶς ἂν ὑπομείνειεν.*) Cf. Bohnenblust *op. cit.*, p. 11. Possibly *pertinacia* is associated with *ira*, as Leo concludes from Cicero *De fin.* 1. 28. It is clear at all events that these four nouns are loosely appended to the more precise groups of 848. Not only is this comparable to the style of *Merc.* 29–31, following 19, 25–28, but if this passage be suspicious, what essential difference is there between these two passages in the *Merc.* and such grouping as we find in *Capt.* 770: *laudem lucrum, ludum iocum, festivitatem ferias, | pompam penum potationes, saturitatem, gaudium?* Here again, four groups rather precisely formed, are followed by *saturitatem*, which resumes the idea of



the preceding triad, and by *gaudium*, which certainly repeats in a measure ideas already expressed in the previous verse, although, to be sure, it has a distinct recapitulating climactic force.

An interpretation of these phenomena in Plautus' grouping of nouns is hardly to be ventured until related phases of his style are studied, and the general development of corresponding features in Latin prose and poetry more thoroughly investigated. For the present a few provisional comments may be hazarded. A racial sensitiveness to orderly logical arrangement may be postulated, and at least in the early stages of Latin literature a racial sensitiveness to sound-effects. In Plautus the poet's own individuality was somewhat at odds with the racial sensitiveness to logical arrangements; to some extent this results from the artistic purpose of his work—comic incongruity may have prompted some of the groupings which we have interpreted, and the character and the situation are always factors to be reckoned with; but it is difficult to escape the conclusion, which is patent from comparisons with Terence and the writers of Greek comedy, that there is back of the artistic purpose an exaggerated sensitiveness to sound-effects, and an inherent tendency to break loose from the bonds of precise, logical grouping, a tendency which is manifested equally well in certain phases of his dramatic technique and other features of his style. Doubtless this tendency was more freely indulged because conscious artistic expression was as yet in its beginnings, but whatever may be said for this, no sympathetic reader can fail to detect the strong, exuberant, if somewhat uncouth personality of the Roman poet even in such a subordinate feature of his style: here at least we are far removed from the atmosphere of his Greek originals.